SINGLE BENCH (4)

CF/1001 (2)

THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W. P. No. 4250 /2006 (5)

PETITIONER : Smt. Padmawati Chauhan, Aged about 45 years, W/o- Jagatram Chauhan, R/O- Tulsinagar, Bakhtawarchaal, Rajnandgaon Distt. Rajnandgaon (C.G.)

P.R. No. 4321/06
Presented by Kanu Das
dated 7/8/06

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS : 1) State of Chhattisgarh Through - Secretary Forest Department D.K.S. Bhawan Raipur (C.G.)

RECEIVED COPY
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR
Balku
7.8.06

2) Conservator of Forest , Circle Durg Distt. Durg (C.G.)

OATH COMMISSIONER
APARNA MALVIYA
CG/2073/96
07/08/06
Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

3) Divisional Forest Officer, Rajnandgaon , Divisional Forest Office, Rajnandgaon (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/ 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

23

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

SINGLE BENCH : HON'BLE MR. SATISH K. AGNIHOTRI, J.

WRIT PETITION (S.) NO.4250 OF 2006

Petitioner : Smt. Padmawati Chauhan

versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and others

Present : Mr. Anup Majumdar, counsel for the petitioner.
Mr. Sushil Dubey, Government Advocate for the State/respondents.

ORDER

(Passed on 20th Day of February, 2007)

The main grievance of the petitioner, who is working as Godown Chowkidar in World Food Godown, Forest Office, Rajnandgaon at Collector's rate, is that as per policy of the Government, the employees, who had been killed in naxalite activities, their dependents shall be entitled for regular appointment and in pursuance of that, vide order dated 24-9-1994, 12 appointments were made. The petitioner was appointed at Collector's rate, whereas other 11 persons were appointed on regular basis and as such, the petitioner was not given similar treatment as given to the other persons. The petitioner made several representations in this regard, but respondent No.3 has not decided the same.

24

2. In the circumstances, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that even though the petitioner has already made representations, but they are not being decided, therefore, the petitioner may be allowed to make a detailed representation to respondent No.3 and in turn, respondent No.3 be directed to decide the representations of the petitioner in accordance with law, to which learned counsel appearing for the State/respondents has no objection.

3. Having heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the petitioner is allowed to make a detailed representation raising all her grievances to respondent No.3 within a period of 15 days from today along with a copy of this petition. In turn, the respondent No.3 is directed to decide the representation of the petitioner within a period of 60 days from the date of receipt of the representation after considering all the grievances raised by the petitioner, in accordance with law.

4. With the direction aforesaid, the writ petition stands disposed of. No order as to cost.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Gopal